

Introduction to Scopes of Work

Great Salt Lake Science Panel Coordination Meeting

ATTENDEES: Theresa Presser
Joe Skorupa
Anne Fairbrother
Don Hayes
Bill Wuerthele
Bill Adams
Bill Moellmer
Theron Miller
Bill Johnson
Brad Marden
Dave Naftz
Mike Conover
Clay Perschon
Harry Ohlendorf
Earl Byron
Gary Santolo
Dan Moore
Jeff DenBleyker

FROM: Jeff DenBleyker

DATE: February 23, 2006

The objective of this meeting was to provide the Science Panel with a brief introduction and opportunity to provide initial feedback for the proposed work for Projects 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Path Forward

Science Panel will review and comment (in Track Changes mode) on each of the scopes of work. These comments will be circulated to the project team for their review. Project team will formulate recommendations and discuss with Panel at two conference calls. One conference call will cover Projects 1 and 2 and the other Projects 3 and 4.

Summary of Today's Discussion

A brief summary of key discussion items is below.

Project 1.

- Map showing bird population data and qualitative nesting habitats along with chronology of nesting patterns would be appreciated as soon as possible.
- There are very few actual nesting data available; they are mostly population data during fall and winter.
- Team will complete only opportunistic sampling of goose and redhead eggs (in addition to planned sampling of avocets, stilts, and gulls).
- We all need to be aware of how many eggs are needed vs. actual number found and how that may influence conclusions.
- Limited USFWS sampling of avocet/stilt eggs suggests Se levels are not high enough to cause deformities. Contact Nathan Darnell for data.
- First-clutch sampling may not be as important as sampling eggs after the birds have been at GSL long enough to reflect local exposure in their eggs. Timing for shrimp/flies abundance dependent on many factors but primarily temperature.

- Joe Skorupa suggested that survey of “every meter of shoreline” for shorebird nests would be nice – would require extensive effort to complete.
- Fly larvae may be a significant source of food for birds.

Project 2.

- ^{15}N may be an important means of correlating food sources and selenium pathways for *Artemia*, and should be considered for seston samples also.
- Should clarify sampling approach for *Artemia* (transect vs. randomly selected sites).

Project 3.

- 1.5 years of record is needed to minimize errors for modeling; can incorporate results after a year but need the second year to improve confidence.
- Is air deposition significant?
- 01 Outfall (KUCC) is only operating 7-8 months/yr. Currently collecting daily flow/Se samples. KUCC and DWQ will make those data available for project. May be able to augment DWQ's monthly samples to do speciation of Se in a few samples.
- Is there biotic migration out of the system? May be able to develop “back of napkin” budget from information from proposed studies.

Project 4.

- Methods to complete Task 1 were discussed
- Will Task 1 characterize what occurs during wind events, i.e., H_2S smell?
- Should FFF-ICP/MS be used for both tasks 3 and 4?